LAS VEGAS POLICE DEPARTMENT	PERSONNEL
SUBJECT: Performance Evaluations	NUMBER: PER.6
EFFECTIVE DATE: 9 September 2010	REVIEW DATE:
AMENDS/SUPERSEDES:	APPROVED: Chief of Police Gary Gold
NMMLEPSC STANDARDS: PER.06.01- PER.06.04	NMSA:

I. <u>PURPOSE</u>:

The purpose of this policy is to ensure the efficient and effective management of the Performance Evaluation function by providing administrative guidance that identifies the responsibilities and processes within the uniform and other organizational components of the department.

II. POLICY:

It is the policy of the Las Vegas Police Department to manage the Performance Evaluation function in an effective and efficient manner by coordinating the efforts of uniform and other organizational components as provided in this policy.

III. APPLICABILITY:

This policy applies to all commissioned and non-commissioned employees of the Las Vegas Police Department

IV. REFERENCES:

- A. NMMLEPSC PER 06.01-04
- B. Department Field Training Guide

V. DEFINITIONS:

None

VI. PROCEDURE:

- A. The department bears an obligation to the public and it's own personnel to hire and maintain the best qualified police officers. To that end, the department regularly and formally evaluates the performance of officers and other employees. The evaluation system discussed herein serves both the interests of management and the department's employees. The purposes of the evaluation system are to (1) allow fair and impartial personnel decisions; (2) maintain and improve performance; (3) provide a basis and a medium for personnel counseling; (4) assist decisions about the tenure of probationary employees; and (5) identify training needs.
 - 1. All Police Officers shall be evaluated using the forms located in the appendix to this order.
 - 2. Evaluations for ALL employees will be conducted on an annual basis. Evaluations on the month of the officers hire date. The evaluations will be completed and submitted to the office of the Chief of Police by the 10th day of the previously mentioned month.
 - 3. Evaluations reflect observations and perceptions by rating personnel, and are, therefore, inherently subjective. Nevertheless, personnel shall be rated according to unacceptable, acceptable or superior behavior. Specific guidelines for rating behavior are found in the appendix to this order.
 - 4. To constitute a satisfactory score, an Officer must receive an overall 3.0 (or satisfactory). Officers who fail to receive an overall 3.0 shall be placed on probation for a period determined by the Chief of Police. Within the probation period, an officer shall receive remedial training in deficient areas, demonstrate proficiency (or satisfactory improvement) in deficient areas, the training and improved behavior documented on the evaluation form. During a probationary period for remedial training, an Officer shall receive evaluations weekly or bi-weekly, at the discretion of the Chief of Police.
 - 5. All evaluations shall be placed in employees' personnel files.
 - 6. All newly hired personnel officers in their probationary year shall receive evaluations at the 6th and the 11th month mark.
 - 7. Officers promoted or transferred to new assignments shall receive evaluations at the 6th and the 11th month mark.
 - 8. All personnel shall be evaluated formally by the next person in the in their chain of command.

9. An Officer who receives an unsatisfactory mark he or she perceives unjust may protest it to the Chief of Police and as per Union Contracts. The Officer concerned must rebut the comments or marks in writing, submitted through the Chain of Command to the Chief of Police. In any case, final appeal extends as per the City of Las Vegas's Employee Policy Manual in writing, through the Chief of Police.

B. Scale Value Application:

- 1. The most difficult task facing the rater is applying the numerical scale, which accompanies categories of behavior. Two raters might not apply the same numerical values to the person under evaluation. To reduce such differences, the appendix to this instruction clearly defines what constitutes unacceptable, acceptable, and superior behavior.
- 2. The philosophy of the evaluation form focuses on observations of demonstrated proficiency in behavior relevant to the job. Proficiency may be demonstrated in a variety of ways:
 - a. Performing the behavior in the field.
 - b. Performing the behavior in a practical exercise or simulation, accompanied by written or oral testing.
 - c. Written or oral testing (for subjects not amenable to field demonstration).
- 3. Any numerical rating below 3 <u>must</u> be documented. Deficiencies in behavior must receive precise documentation. For example, an officer might receive a "1" (unacceptable) under category six, officer safety. In the comments section, the rater would write, "Officer consistently presents his gun to traffic violators and approaches stopped vehicles with objects in both hands."
- 4. The categories of behavior represent key areas of police behavior. The categories are aligned in four subjects:
 - a. critical performance tasks
 - b. knowledge
 - c. attitude/relations
 - d. appearance

- C. Evaluation of Investigators/Agents, Sergeants, Lieutenants, Captains and Civilian Employees:
 - 1. Civilian employees shall be evaluated on forms used specifically for non-commissioned personnel.
 - 2. Investigators/Agents shall be evaluated using the proper form for the position. Under "comments," the rater shall specifically refer to the accomplishments, training, and behavior as an Investigator.
 - 3. The Sergeants, Lieutenants, and Captains shall be evaluated using the same form as that for Officers. Under "comments" the rater shall refer to an attached page containing, in a narrative, comments concerning the supervisory performance. The rater shall address, at a minimum, the following points:
 - a. Ability to instill in Officers a high regard and respect for the rule of law, civil rights, and concern for victims.
 - b. Ability to perceive performance weaknesses in his Officers, conduct remedial training, and document improved proficiency.
 - c. Command of patrol techniques, methods, and investigative procedures.
 - d. Ability to reprimand, counsel, praise, or otherwise discipline his Officers.
 - e. Ability to take responsibility for the performance of his Officers.

VII. ATTACHMENTS:

A. Performance Evaluation Form

[The performance evaluation program defined in this order derives from the Field Training Officer (FTO) model. The FTO evaluation system identifies key behaviors performed by Police Officers, defines the minimum acceptable performance in each, and expects Officers to demonstrate proficiency in all key behaviors.]

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

'	The narrative portion of the evaluation follows the scale ratings. Refer to the rating guide for						
							
	specif	ic comr	nents ar	e require	ed to justify		
		Supe	erior		Not Observed		
	4		5				
1	2	3	4	5	N.O		
1	2	3	4	5	N.O		
1	2	3	4	5	N.O		
1	2	3	4	5	N.O		
1	2	3	4	5	N.O		
1	2	3	4	5	N.O		
ı	2	3	4	5	N.O		
1	2	3	4	5	N.O		
1	2	3	4	5	N.O		
1	2	3	4	5	N.O		
1	2	3	4	5	N.O		
etails) l	2	3	4	5	N.O		
nission 1		3	4	5	N.O.		
1	2	3	4	5	N.O		
	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	The rest the so an exp may of specific Rating 4 1	The narrative the scale ration an explanation may commer specific commers. Super 4 1	The narrative portion the scale ratings. Resan explanation of the may comment on any specific comments are Ratings of "1," "2," of Superior Superior 1 2 3 4	The narrative portion of the ethe scale ratings. Refer to the an explanation of the rated between may comment on any observe specific comments are require Ratings of "1," "2," or "5." Superior 4 5 1 2 3 4 5		

	Not Acceptable		Acceptable			Sup	erior		Not Observed
	1	2	3		4		5		
CRIM	MINAL PERFO	RMANC	E TASKS						
(15)	Orientation skill (non-stress	s cond.)	1	2	3	4	5	N.O
(16) R	Report writing (g	rammar/sp	elling/neatn	ess)	2	3	4	5	N.O
(17) R	Report writing (ap	propriate	time used)	1	2	3	4	5	N.O
(18) S	elf-initiated activ	vity		1	2	3	4	5	N.O
(19) P	roblem-solved/d	ecision-m	aking	1	2	3	4	5	N.O
KNO	WLEDGE								
(20) K	nowledge of dep	artment r	ules and ord	ers l	2	3	4	5	N.O
(21) K	nowledge of crir	ninal law		1	2	3	4	5	N.O
(22) K	nowledge of traf	fic law		1	2	3	4	5	N.O
ATTI	FUDE/RELATI	<u>ONS</u>							
(23) A	cceptance of feed	lback		1	2	3	4	5	N.O
(24) Re	elationship with	citizens		1	2	3	4	5	N.O
(25) Re	elationship with	co-worker	s/super.	1	2	3	4	5	N.O
(26) G	eneral demeanor			1	2	3	4	5	N.O
APPE	ARANCE								
(27) Ge	eneral appearance	e		1	2	3	4	5	N.O

Overali Average Score____

PRINCIPAL STRENGHS OBSERVED DURING THE EVA	LUATION PERIOD:
PRINCIPAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED DURING THE E	VALUATION PERIOD:
SUPERVISOR'S SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:	
EMPLOYEE'S REMARKS:	
WHAT ACTIONS HAVE BEEN TAKEN SINCE THE LAST IMPROVE PERFORMANCE:	F EVALUATION TO
Rating Authority(Print name and sign)	Date
(Print name and sign)	
Employee's Signature	Date

Date_

Chief of Police's Signature_

Form Rev. 08/10

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

NAME:	TITLE/ASSIGNMENT:
EVALUATION PERIOD:	DATE OF EVALUATION:

PERFORMANCE RATING INSTRUCTIONS:

The narrative portion of the evaluation follows the scale ratings. Refer to the rating guide for an explanation of the rated behaviors. Raters may comment on any observed behavior, but specific comments are required to justify. Ratings range from 1 thru 5.

	Not Acceptable		Acceptable		Suj	perior		Not (Observed
	1	2	3	4		5		N	I/O
ATT	TTUDE/RELA	TIONS							
(1)	Attendance	and Depe	ndability	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(2)	Acceptance	of Feedba	ack	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(3)	Attitude Tov Work	wards Rec	cords	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(4)	Attitude Tov Records Per		periors/	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(5)	Attitude Tov	wards Citi	zens	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
KNO	WLEDGE								
(6)	Knowledge o	f Polices, ies	Procedures,	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(7)	Knowledge o Resources	f Geogra	phy and	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(8)	Knowledge of Information	of Equipm Resources	nent, Systems, s	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
RECO	ORDS PERFO	RMANC	E TASKS						
(9)	Memory Reta Correlate Inf		d Ability to	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(10)	Use of Good Making	Judgeme	nt, Decision	1	2	3	4	5	N/O

	Not Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable			Acceptable Superior				Not Observed		
	1 2	1 2 3			5			N/O				
(11)	Ability to Multi-Ta	ask	1	2	3	4	5	N/O				
(12)	Accuracy		1	2	3	4	5	N/O				
(13)	Team Work		1	2	3	4	5	N/O				
(14)	Initiative To Solve Problems		1	2	3	4	5	N/O				
(15)	Customer/ Call-Taking Skills		1	2	3	4	5	N/O				
(16)	Customer Control, Obtaining Pertinent Information.		1	2	3	4	5	N/O				
(17)	Entry of Report Details, Proper Incident Type & Identifiers		1	2	3	4	5	N/O				
(18)	Communication/Customer Techniques.		1	2	3	4	5	N/O				
(19)	Listening and Comprehension Skills		° 1	2	3	4	5	N/O				
(20)	Concerns for Prope	er Release of Informatio	n 1	2	3	4	5	N/O				

	O	verall	Average	e Score		
--	---	--------	---------	---------	--	--

PRINCIPAL STRENGTHS OBSERVED DURING THE EVALUATION:

PRINCIPAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED DURING THE EVALUATION PERIOD:

SUPERVISOR'S SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:

EMPLOYEE'S REMARKS:

WHAT ACTIONS HAVE BEEN TAKEN SINCE THE LAST EVALUATION TO IMPROVE PERFORMANCE:

Rating Authority (Print name and sign)	Date	
Employee's Signature		
Deputy Chief's Signature		
Chief's Signature	Date	

Form Rev. 10/07

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

NAME:	TITLE/ASSIGNMENT:	
EVALUATION PERIOD:	DATE OF EVALUATION:	

PERFORMANCE RATING INSTRUCTIONS:

The narrative portion of the evaluation follows the scale ratings. Refer to the rating guide for an explanation of the rated behaviors. Raters may comment on any observed behavior, but specific comments are required to justify. Ratings range from 1 thru 5.

	Not Acceptable	A	Acceptable		Sup	erior		Not O	bserved
	1	2	3	4		5		N/O	
ATT	TUDE/RELA	<u>TIONS</u>							
(1)	Attendance	and Dependal	bility	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(2)	Acceptance	of Feedback		1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(3)	Attitude Tov Work	wards Commu	nication	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(4)	Attitude Tov Communicat	wards Superio	ors/ el	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(5)	Attitude Tov	wards Citizens	S	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
KNO	WLEDGE								
(6)	Knowledge o	of Polices, Prones	ocedures,	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(7)	Knowledge of Resources	of Geography	and	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(8)	Knowledge of Information	of Equipment Resources	, Systems,	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
COM	MUNICATIO	N PERFORM	ANCE TASI	<u>ks</u>					
(9)	Memory Ret	ention and Al ormation	oility to	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(10)	Use of Good Making	Judgement, I	Decision	1	2	3	4	5	N/O

	Not Acceptable	Acceptable		Sup	erior		Not Obs	erved
	1 2	3	4		5		N/O	
COM	MUNICATION PERFO	RMANCE TASI	<u> </u>					
(11)	Ability to Multi-Task		1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(12)	Accuracy		1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(13)	Team Work		1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(14)	Initiative To Solve Pro	blems	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(15)	Dispatch/ Call-Taking	Skills	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(16)	Control Of Call, Obtain	ning Pertinent	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(17)	Entry of Call Details, I Type, Identifier	Proper Incident	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(18)	Police/ EMS/ Fire Radi Techniques	io Dispatch	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(19)	Listening and Compreh	nension	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
(20)	Concerns for Officers/ Safety	EMS/ Firefighter	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
		Overall Aver	age Score		%			

PRINCIPAL STRENGTHS OBSERVED DURING THE EVALUATION:

PRINCIPAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED DURING THE EVALUATION PERIOD:

SUPERVISOR'S SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:

EMPLOYEE'S REMARKS:

WHAT ACTIONS HAVE BEEN TAKEN SINCE THE LAST EVALUATION TO IMPROVE PERFORMANCE:

Rating Authority (Print name and sign)	Date
(Frint name and Sign)	
Employee's Signature	Date
Chief of Police's Signature	Date

Form Rev. 12/99